

5th March 1925]

- (c) Subsidies have been granted to local bodies which are levying the education tax and are yet unable to open schools in all villages with a population of 1,000 and above unprovided with schools.
- (d) & (e) Education tax is being levied in twenty-two out of twenty-five districts in the Presidency. It is not clear what taluk boards the hon. Member has in mind when he refers to the 'poorer' ones; nor can the reference to taluk boards which have wilfully refused to levy the education tax be understood.

Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai.

* 387 Q.—MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the Director of Public Instruction delayed the recognition of the IV and V Forms in the Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai, and whether the municipal council appealed to Government about it;
- (b) whether the subsidy now paid to the institution is not one fixed at a time when the high school had only three forms;
- (c) the amount of building and equipment grants granted to the Mission High School at the same place after it was made a high school and the amount of building and equipment grant to the Municipal High School;
- (d) whether the municipal council has constructed a building for the high school at a cost of about Rs. 20,000;
- (e) whether subsidies to local bodies for maintaining schools are fixed with reference to the net annual cost;
- (f) whether the subsidy to this municipal council was not raised, when its net cost of maintaining the high school was raised;
- (g) the strength of the high school classes at the end of December 1924, (i) in the Municipal High School and (ii) in the Mission High School; and
- (h) the average cost to Government per pupil for education in the high school classes in each of the above high schools?

A.—(a) Forms IV and V in the school were opened in 1921 and 1922, respectively, and the Government approved the action of the Municipal Council in G.O. No. 1934, L. & M., dated 14th October 1922. The Chairman thereafter applied for recognition of those forms and the Inspector of Schools recommended it. The Inspector was informed by the Director of Public Instruction that no formal recognition was necessary as the classes were opened with the permission of the Government.

- (b) Yes.
- (c) Particulars of grants sanctioned for the Mission High School are not available. Subsidies granted to the Municipal High School are not governed by the rules in Grant-in-Aid Code.
- (d) The Chairman reported in September 1924 that the total outlay on the building constructed for the school amounted to Rs. 18,028.
- (e) Not in all cases.
- (f) No.
- (g) & (h) The information is not available.

[5th March 1925]

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I ask the hon. Minister whether, if the strength of the classes is increased, Government will not also increase their grants ? ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—“ There seems to be no ground for such apprehension.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Tiruvannamalai is an important centre, a place of pilgrimage. It is a well-known fact that such municipal towns have heavy demands to meet. The municipality is afraid whether Government would contribute anything towards the increased expenditure of the school, if they increase the strength of the school. That is the object of this interpellation. There is also apprehension on the part of the people of Tiruvannamalai that the Mission High School is being more favoured than the Municipal High School.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—“ It is not so.”

The Islamiah Secondary School, Trichinopoly.

* 388 Q.—Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) when the Muhammadan Educational Association of Trichinopoly first proposed to hand over the management of the Islamiah Secondary School to the Government ;

(b) whether the Government took charge of the control and management of the school as early as 1919 ; and whether the school was legally transferred to the Government in 1923 ;

(c) why the Government have not till now made the school permanent ;

(d) whether a similar institution started in Vellore in the year 1919 was made permanent and was raised to the status of a high school ;

(e) whether the Government undertook in 1917 and in 1923 to raise the institution to the status of a high school immediately after the question of its legal transfer was complete and to put up a pucca building for its location ;

(f) why they have not carried out these undertakings ;

(g) whether it is a fact that every year since 1919 the Government are spending Rs. 100 to Rs. 300 towards the repairing of the shed under which classes have been held since then ; and

(h) whether it is not a fact that the District Collector of Trichinopoly once asked the Deputy Superintendent of Police to inspect the school ; if so, the result of the inspection ?

A.—(a) In 1916.

(b) The answer to the first part of the clause is in the affirmative. In October 1924 the Director of Public Instruction reported that the transfer of the properties of the school to Government had been effected.

(c) The question of the permanent retention of the school will be considered when the strength of the school improves.

(d) Yes.

(e) No. According to the terms of transfer of management of the school the institution was to be raised to the status of a high school as soon as circumstances appeared favourable.